



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/582,656

04/03/2007

Raymond John Bacon

508-051.008

1498

4955

7590

08/31/2010

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

KUMAR, RAKESH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3651

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/31/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/582,656	Applicant(s) BACON, RAYMOND JOHN	
	Examiner RAKESH KUMAR	Art Unit 3651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,5,6,12-14,17,18,21,22 and 26-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-11,15,19,20 and 23-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/07/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Final Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1,3,4,7-11,15,16,19,20 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dessertine (US 5,020,527) in view of Hoerlins (WO 01/37909A1).

Referring to claims 1,10,15,19,20 and 23-25. Dessertine discloses a dispenser (Figure 1) for dispensing a substance (15) in individual portions counted by a multi-use counter (Figure 4) having a display incremented or decremented with the count of portions (see Figure 4) dispensed and a dispense action detector (23) for detection of portion dispensing, the dispenser comprising :

- a body (1) having a dispensing orifice (13 through opening at 5);
- a container (15) for the substance, the container (15) being integral with or accommodated on the body (1);
- a mechanism (47) in the body (1) and/or the container for dispensing individual portions of the substance to the orifice (13), the mechanism having:
 - a displaceable element (47) for initiating the dispensing action;

Art Unit: 3651

- an accommodation (25; wherein member 21 is mounted to member 1) on the body (1) for the counter (51) with its detector (23) arranged for detection of dispensing actions of the mechanism (Figure 1).

Dessertine does not disclose a closure adapted to enclosing the counter and does not disclose the closure is tamper evident.

Hoerlins discloses a dispenser wherein the closure (cap 7) is adapted to co-operate with a portion of the body (see threads for attachment of member 7 to member 3; Figure 5) providing the accommodation for removably enclosing the counter (8) in the accommodation characterized in that the closure (cap 7) is tamper evident (if removed from the dispenser).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Dessertine to have included a closure cap adapted to enclose the counter to the body of the apparatus such that the removal of the closure cap would be tamper evident if removed from the dispenser as taught by Hoerlins because enclosing the counter would prevent accidental activation of the counter and also alert a user if the closure is removed from the apparatus thus the cap is tamper evident if removed.

Referring to claim 3,4. Hoerlins discloses dispenser wherein the closure is adapted to be irremovably connected to the body and provided with a frangible portion through which the counter can be removed (see Figure 4).

Referring to claim 7. Hoerlins discloses dispenser wherein the closure is a cap (7) over the end of the receptacle to captivate the counter (8).

Referring to claim 8,9,11. Hoerlins discloses dispenser wherein the closure (7) has a window for viewing (19) the display of the counter (8).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/01/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See modified rejection above.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

Art Unit: 3651

of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, the Horlin discloses a closure (cap 7) adapted to cooperate with a portion of the body, the closure removably enclosing the counter in the accommodation (see Figure 2a) disposed over the counter mechanism. It is in the view of the Office the teaching of removing the closure is tamper evident because a user would realize the closure has been removed.

The applicant argues "that neither Dessertine nor Hoerlin disclose a dispenser having a tamper evident enclosure as required by the amended claims." In view of the Office Hoerlin discloses an apparatus wherein the housing of the dispenser comprises a counting wheel (8) and a control wheel (9) enclosed by a circular cap denoted by member (7). The cap (7) serves as an outer casing for the counting mechanism (2) and further the cap is provided with an indicator window allowing visual access to the counter mechanism underneath. Hoerlin attaches the cap enclosure to the dispensing apparatus by the means of threads disposed on the dispenser housing (see Figure 5).

Thus, the cap encloses the counting mechanism and attaches the counting mechanism to the apparatus. It is thus, cited that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Dessertine to include a outer casing cap as taught by Hoerlin because the outer casing cap could be used to attach the counting mechanism to the dispensing

Art Unit: 3651

apparatus and furthermore would be tamper evident if the outer casing cap is removed from the apparatus.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **RAKESH KUMAR** whose telephone number is (571) 272-8314. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 AM to 4:30 PM.

Art Unit: 3651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Crawford can be reached on (571) 272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gene Crawford/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3651

/RAKESH KUMAR/
Examiner, Art Unit 3651